

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 15 2007



DIRECTV.

FAX COVER SHEET

PLEASE CONFIRM RECEIPT OF THIS FACSIMILE

Attention: MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS

Fax: (571) 273-8300

Group Art Unit: 2144

Examiner: SHAW, PELING ANDY

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Phone: (571) 272-7968

Pages: Cover + 1 + 5 = 7

Date: October 15, 2007

From: Anthony J. Orler

Fax: (310) 964-0941

Phone: (310) 964-0735

The information contained in this facsimile is confidential and may also contain privileged attorney-client information or work product. The information is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received the facsimile in error, please immediately notify us by telephone, and return the original message to us at the address below via the U.S. Postal Service. Thank you.

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that the correspondence identified above is being facsimile transmitted to (571) 273-8300 (Centralized Facsimile Number), addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on October 15, 2007.

Janet Shibata
(Printed Name of Depositor)October 15, 2007
(Date of Signature)

Telephone No. 310-964-0736

Re: Serial No. 09/940,141
Filing Date: August 23, 2001

Attorney Docket No. PD-201118

Please find attached:

- TRANSMITTAL FORM PTO/SB/21 (1 page)
- REPLY BRIEF IN RESPONSE TO EXAMINER'S ANSWERS DATED NOVEMBER 1, 2006, NOVEMBER 24, 2006 AND OCTOBER 5, 2007 (5 pages)

If you do not receive all pages, or pages are not clear, please call Karen Lum at (310) 964-0735.

The DirectV Group, Inc., CA/LA1/A109, P. O. Box 956, El Segundo CA 90245

PTO/SB/21 (10-07)

Approved for use through 10/31/2007, OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

**TRANSMITTAL
FORM**

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

6

Application Number	09/940,141
Filing Date	08-23-2001
First Named Inventor	Douglas Chelme
Art Unit	2144
Examiner Name	SHAW, Peling Andy
Attorney Docket Number	PD-201118

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 15 2007

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)


<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation <input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
Remarks _____		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm Name	The DIRECTV Group, Inc.		
Signature			
Printed name	Anthony J. Orler		
Date	October 15, 2007	Reg. No.	41,232

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:

Signature			
Typed or printed name	Janet Shibata	Date	October 15, 2007


This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 15 2007

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Douglas Cheline et al.	Certificate of Facsimile Transmission Under 37 CFR 1.8
Serial No.: 09/940,141	I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on <u>October 15, 2007.</u>
Filing Date: 08-23-2001	 Janet Shibata (Typed or printed name of person signing certificate)
For: SINGLE-MODEM MULTI-USER VIRTUAL PRIVATE NETWORK	Telephone No. 310-964-0736
Group Art Unit: 2144	
Examiner: SHAW, Peling Andy	
Attorney Docket No.: PD-201118	
Customer No. 020991	

REPLY BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.41, the Applicants hereby respectfully submit the following Reply Brief in support of their appeal. This Reply Brief is in response to the Examiner's first answer dated November 1, 2006, Examiner's second answer dated November 24, 2006 and Examiner's third answer dated October 5, 2007.

Serial No. 09/940,141

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 15 2007

(1) Status of Claims

Claims 1-9, 11-20, and 22-23 are pending. All of the claims are under final rejection.

(2) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

(A) Whether Claims 1-5, 8-9, 11-16, 19-20 and 22-23 are anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102 by U.S. Published Application 2002/0178361 to Genty ("the Genty application")?

(B) Whether claims 6 and 17 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Genty?

(C) Whether claims 7 and 18 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Genty in view of U.S. Published Application 2002/0169988 to Vandergeest?

(3) Argument

A. Applicant's Claim Language is Fully Supported by the Specification and Drawings

The Examiner's First and Second Answers stated that:

Appellant's quoted Figs. 4a-c teach the procedure of establish[ing] VPN connection for multiple clients. However, Figs. 4a-c do not show how multiple VPN connections could or would be established for multiple computers. Applicant is silent in what it takes to establish multiple VPN connections. Even if 4a-c is meant to apply to multiple computers, how multiple VPN connections could be coordinated, unless coordination is taking place in the modem. Thus Figs. 4a-c seems to be merely a program routine in handling incoming multiple VPN connection requests.

The Applicants respectfully disagree with these assertions. Specifically, as asserted in the Applicants' Appeal Brief and described in the Applicants' specification, FIGs. 4a-c "are flow charts for establishing multiple VPN tunnels over a single modem." Specification, page 21, lines

Serial No. 09/940,141

21-22. A user requests the initiation of a VPN session (step 402 of FIG. 4a). The request is received (step 404) and a login interface is transmitted (step 406) to the client computer. The login interface is received by the client computer (step 408). Login details (e.g., username, password) as well as other information (e.g., a SecurID token) are transmitted to the modem (step 410). The Media Access Control (MAC) address and/or the IP address of the computer is determined and stored at the modem (step 414). The modem then configures its security settings (step 415), for example, using an IPsec implementation. The modem then communicates with an authentication server to determine if access should be granted (steps 416-428).

If access is granted, a VPN tunnel is established between the client having the stored IP or MAC address and the server side system. Firewall rules are added to the packet filtering firewall to allow full access to the server side system from only the client computer where the request originated. Other users may form other tunnels via the same manner using this same procedure. See Applicants' Specification page 22, line 18, to page 26, line 20.

In other words, the approaches described by the Applicants with respect to FIGs. 4a-c are used repeatedly to establish multiple VPN tunnels between different client side systems and different server side systems over a single modem. Consequently, the Applicants are not silent as to "what it takes" to establish multiple VPN connections and have described how to do so in great detail.

B. Genty Does Not Teach or Suggest Establishing Tunnels Between Different Client Side Computers and Different Server Side Systems

The Examiner's First and Second Answers asserted that "Genty shows the establishment of multiple VPNs (multiple users) through one modem (multiple sites via ISDN modem) via Internet (WAN connection)." The First and Second Answers further asserted that a "modem could be shared for multiple VPN connections as per item 100 in figure 1 and item 200 in figure 2 of Genty. As IPsec is used to implement VPN and a VPN connection is between two computers as shown on figure 2 of Genty, the figure 1 and paragraph 9 per Genty certainly has shown multiple computers per items 130, 150 and 170 must be able to establish multiple VPN

Serial No. 09/940,141

connections with either servers (shown in figure 1) or each other." The Applicants respectfully disagree with these assertions.

Applicants' claims recite the establishment of a tunnel between a client side computer and a server side system using a modem. Thereafter, a *different* tunnel is established between a *different* client side computer and a *new* (i.e., different) server side system over the *same* modem.

In contrast, Genty does not teach or suggest that a single modem could be shared to establish multiple tunnels between *different* client computers and *different* destination computers as recited in the claims. In fact, Genty teaches exactly the opposite. Specifically, in FIG. 1 of Genty, computers in VPNs 120, 140, and 160 communicate with the *same* computer 100. There is no indication that any of the computers in networks 120, 140, or 160 communicate with any other or different *server-side* entity but the computer 100. Furthermore, even if computers within a particular VPN 120, 140, or 160 might communicate with each other, any communication would be within the same network (i.e., not between different client side computers and different server side computers).

Additionally, with respect to the system illustrated in FIG. 2 of Genty, the computers 230, 240, 250, and 260 all communicate with the *same* computer 200. In fact, there is no indication that any of the computer systems 230, 240, 250, or 260 communicate with anything other than the computer system 200. In other words, in the system illustrated in FIG. 2 of Genty, *different* client side computers do not communicate with *different* server side systems using the same modem as recited in the claims.

C. Pai is Silent as to Tunneling and Tunneling between Different Client Side Computers and Different Server-Side Computers

The Examiner's First and Second Answers asserted that U.S. Patent No. 6,711,138 to Pai shows a WAN that "is connected via DSL for multiple computers in a home network, i.e., a LAN. Thus sharing a modem for multiple computers connecting to a WAN is well known." The Applicants respectfully disagree with these assertions.

Serial No. 09/940,141

As an initial matter, the Applicants respectfully point out that the claims have not been rejected under the Pai reference or because the claimed subject matter was "well known." Additionally, the Applicants respectfully assert that they have not claimed "sharing a modem" as stated in the Examiner's First and Second Answers.

Furthermore, Pai does not teach or suggest what the Applicants have claimed, namely, the establishment of multiple tunnels between *different* client computers and *different* destination computers using the same modem. Specifically, the Pai reference does show a modem 120 that is part of a DSL system. However, Pai is silent as to the use of tunnels (indeed, the term "tunnel" is not mentioned in Pai) let alone whether any tunnels could connect different client computers to different server-side computers. Because of these reasons, the Applicants assert that the Applicants' claims are allowable over Pai alone or in combination with any other cited reference.

D. Conclusion

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required to Deposit Account No. 50-0383.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Anthony J. Orley
Registration No. 41.232

Date: October 15, 2007

Address all correspondence to:
The DIRECTV Group, Inc.
CA/LA1/A109
P.O. Box 956
El Segundo, CA 90245
Telephone: (310) 964-0735